



Office de la propriété  
intellectuelle  
du Canada  
Un organisme  
d'Industrie Canada  
[www.cipo.gc.ca](http://www.cipo.gc.ca)

Canadian  
Intellectual Property  
Office  
An Agency of  
Industry Canada  
[www.cipo.gc.ca](http://www.cipo.gc.ca)



RECEIVED

FEB 25 2005

SIM & MCBURNEY  
SMM, HUGHES, ASHTON & MCKAY

February 21, 2005

**SIM & MCBURNEY**  
6th Floor  
330 University Avenue  
TORONTO Ontario  
M5G 1R7

**Application No.** : 2,407,503  
**Owner** : MATSUSHITA GRAPHIC COMMUNICATION SYSTEMS, INC.  
**Title** : ACTIVATION OF MULTIPLE XDSL MODEMS WITH IMPLICIT  
CHANNEL PROBE  
**Classification** : H04M-11/06  
**Your File No.** : 9116-126 MIS:sd  
**Examiner** : S.Chhim

**YOU ARE HEREBY NOTIFIED OF :**

- A REQUISITION BY THE EXAMINER IN ACCORDANCE WITH SUBSECTION 30(2) OF THE PATENT RULES;
- A REQUISITION BY THE EXAMINER IN ACCORDANCE WITH SECTION 29 OF THE PATENT RULES.

IN ORDER TO AVOID MULTIPLE ABANDONMENTS UNDER PARAGRAPH 73(1)(A) OF THE PATENT ACT, A WRITTEN REPLY TO EACH REQUISITION MUST BE RECEIVED WITHIN 6 MONTHS AFTER THE ABOVE DATE.

This application has been examined taking into account applicant's correspondence received in this office on January 5, 2005 and January 10, 2005.

The number of claims in this application is 23.

The examiner has identified the following defects in the application:

The claims are directed to a plurality of alleged inventions as follows:

**Group A** - Claims 1-14 are directed to a method for communicating data, being able to transmit first negotiation data to a first device; and  
**Group B** - Claims 15-23 are directed to a method for communicating data being able to exchange negotiation data between a first device and a second device.

The claims must be limited to one invention only as set out in section 36 of the Patent Act.

The search of the prior art has revealed the following:

2,407,503

- 2 -

References Applied:United States Patents

5,311,578	May 10, 1994	379/97	Bremer et al.
5,644,573	July 1, 1997	370/503	Bingham et al.

Bremer et al. disclose a technique for automatic identification of a remote modem

Bingham et al. disclose methods for coordinating upstream discrete multi-tone data transmissions

Claims 1, 8 and 15 do not comply with section 28.3 of the *Patent Act*. The subject matter of these claims would have been obvious on the claim date to a person skilled in the art or science to which they pertain having regard to Bremer et al. or Bingham et al..

Claims 1 and 8 are obvious, because Bremer et al. teach a method for use in a modem for identifying a remote modem, with a procedure comprising a standard signal to be sent from the remote modem to modem, wherein the method comprises the steps of receiving the standard signal in the modem, detecting in the standard signal a hidden signal, which is a representative of an identity of the remote modem, and sending a different hidden signal from the modem to the remote modem for signaling to the remote modem the identity of the modem. Features in claims 1 and 15, namely the sending first data to a first device, and the receiving second data from a first device, are similar features in the Bremer et al.'s teachings.

Claim 15 is obvious, because Bingham et al. teach a method, which recognizes a conflict, when more than one remote units transmit an associated broad band initialization signal during a first selected synchronization time, transmits a conflict signal to the remote units in response to the broad band initialization signals, when a conflict is recognized, and wherein the conflicting remote units resend its broad band initialization signal, the conflicting remote units are arranged to each wait, a random interval prior to resending its broad band initialization signal. Features of claim 15, namely establishing a connection between a first device at a first location and a second device at a second location, and exchanging negotiation data between the first device and the second device, perform the same tasks of those claimed by Bingham et al.

Therefore, claims 1, 8 and 15 do not comply with Section 28.3 of the *Patent Act*.

In view of the foregoing defects, the applicant is requisitioned, under subsection 30(2) of the *Patent Rules*, to amend the application in order to comply with the *Patent Act* and the *Patent Rules* or to provide arguments as to why the application does comply.

2,407,503

- 3 -

Under subsection 29(1) of the *Patent Rules*, the applicant is requisitioned to provide an identification of any prior art cited in respect of the United States Patent and Trademark Office, and European Patent Office applications describing the same invention on behalf of the applicant or on behalf of any other person claiming under an inventor named in the present application, and the patent numbers, if granted. Amendment to avoid references cited abroad may expedite the prosecution. In accordance with subsection 29(3) of the *Patent Rules*, if the particulars are not available to the applicant, the reason must be stated.

S.Chhim  
Patent Examiner  
(819) 997-2238